

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

JAMILAH SABREE,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 06-C-78

v.

OXFORD MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC.

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE PROTECTIVE ORDER

On November 2, 2006, this court entered a protective order. The entry of that order followed a chronology which first involved the plaintiff seeking such an order, the defendant objecting, the defendant then requesting such an order, the parties' inability to agree as to its contents, and the court entering the order in the form set forth in the Local Rules of this district. The plaintiff has now moved to have the court vacate its order on the ground that the defendant has failed to establish good cause for its entry. More specifically, the plaintiff contends that the defendant's reasons in support of the protective order are false.

The court's protective order shall stand. The fact that both parties, at one time or another, sought the protection of such an order, persuades the court that good cause exists for the entry of same. Even though the reasons expressed by the parties may have differed, its entry was appropriate and justified. The reasons offered by the plaintiff appear to be more in the nature of a challenge to the defendant's designation of certain documents being denominated as confidential. However, if the

plaintiff objects to the designation of certain documents as confidential, the order itself contains procedures for challenging such designation.

Finally, the fact that there is a protective order will not prejudice the plaintiff if some of the documents received during discovery are subject to the protective order.

Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion to vacate the protective order is **denied**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 8th day of November, 2006.

s/AARON E. GOODSTEIN
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE